

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

MELODY L. WILLIAMS,	:	Case No. 3:15-cv-388
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Thomas M. Rose
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
OHIO DEPARTMENT OF	:	
REHABILITATION AND	:	
CORRECTIONS, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**ENTRY AND ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS (DOC. 84),
ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS (DOC. 83), DENYING
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (DOC. 62),
GRANTING DEFENDANTS’ MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (DOC.
72), DENYING DEFENDANTS’ MOTIONS TO STRIKE (DOCS. 78, 82) AS
MOOT, AND TERMINATING CASE**

This case is before the Court on the Objections (Doc. 84) filed by Plaintiff Melody L. Williams (“Williams”) to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendations (“Report”) (Doc. 83). Williams is a former inmate at the Dayton Correctional Institution (DCI) and is currently incarcerated at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. She brought this case *pro se* under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claiming that DCI violated her constitutional right of access to the courts and retaliated against her for exercising the same right. Defendants are Gary Mohr, Director of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections; Wanza Jackson, Warden of DCI; and John Mobley, librarian at DCI.

This case was before Magistrate Judge Sharon L. Ovington on Williams's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 62), Williams's Response in Opposition (Doc. 76), Defendants' Motions to Strike and the parties' related memoranda (Docs. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82), and the record as a whole. In the Report, Magistrate Judge Ovington recommended that the Court enter summary judgment in Defendants' favor on Williams's claims. Williams filed Objections (Doc. 84) to the Report. Defendants neither objected to any part of the Report nor responded to Williams's Objections. This matter is therefore ripe for review.

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has made a *de novo* review of the record in this case. Upon said review, the Court finds that Williams's Objections (Doc. 84) to the Report (Doc. 83) are not well-taken and they are hereby **OVERRULED**. The Court therefore **ADOPTS** the Report (Doc. 83) in its entirety and rules as follows:

1. Williams's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 62) is **DENIED**;
2. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 72) is **GRANTED**;
3. Defendants' Motions to Strike (Docs. 78, 82) are **DENIED** as moot; and
4. This case is **TERMINATED** on the Court's docket.

DONE and **ORDERED** in Dayton, Ohio, this Thursday, March 1, 2018.

s/Thomas M. Rose

THOMAS M. ROSE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE